R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 484 EA 000 716

DIRECTED CHANGE IN FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS--THE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

BY- GALLAHER, ART, JR.
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE

PUB DATE FEB 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00 25P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, *PUBLIC SCHOOLS, *EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, *CHANGE AGENTS, *ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, ANTHROPOLOGY, CULTURE CONFLICT, EUGENE,

FROM AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW, THE SUCCESS OF AN ADVOCATE TO ACHIEVE DIRECTED CHANGE IN A FORMAL ORGANIZATION DEPENDS PRIMARILY UPON FOUR VARIABLES--(1) THE WAY THE ADVOCATE PLAYS HIS ROLE, (2) THE TARGET SYSTEM'S DEPENDENCE UPON AUTHORITY, (3) THE EXPECTATION OF CHANGE SHARED BY MEMBERS OF THE TARGET SYSTEM, AND (4) THE EXTENT OF THE TARGET SYSTEM'S FELT NEED FOR CHANGE. NETWORKS OF INFORMAL RELATIONS AND UNOFFICIAL NORMS MAY IMPEDE ACCEPTANCE OF INNOVATION. THE FORMAL ORGANIZATION'S SIGNIFICANCE FOR CHANGE IS DERIVED FROM THE BOUNDARIES FOR WHICH THE ORGANIZATION'S AUTHORITY IS LEGITIMATED, GOALS ARE DEFINED, AND DECISIONS ARE MADE. SUCCESSFUL INNOVATION IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM AS A FORMAL ORGANIZATION, THEREFORE, REQUIRES KNOWLEDGE OF BOTH THE FORMAL AND INFORMAL ASPECTS OF THE SYSTEM. THE POSSIBLE NECESSITY OF DERIVING INNOVATIONS FROM LARGER REGIONAL OR NATION-STATE SYSTEMS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS WITHIN THE LOCAL CLIENT-SERVING SCHOOL SYSTEM CONSTITUTES A MAJOR PROBLEM AREA FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATORS. BECAUSE THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR OCCUPIES A BALANCING ROLE, MAINTAINING A WORKING EQUILIBRIUM BETWEEN COMPONENT ELEMENTS OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, A NEW AND SPECIFICALLY INNOVATIVE ACTIVITY IS SUGGESTED, TO WHICH PERSONNEL WOULD BE ASSIGNED AS ADVOCATES FOR THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF MANAGING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE. THE COMPLETE DOCUMENT, "CHANGE PROCESSES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS," IS AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON 97403, FOR $2.00. (JK)

ED013484

Change Processes in the Public Schools

EA 000 716

The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon is a national research and development center which was established under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education. The research and development reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Division of Laboratories and Research Development of the United States Office of Education. No federal funds were used in the publication of this report.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Change Processes in the Public Schools

RICHARD O. CARLSON
ART GALLAHER, JR.
MATTHEW B. MILES
ROLAND J. PELLEGRIN
EVERETT M. ROGERS

A publication of
THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Eugene, Oregon

$2.00

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Roland Pellegrin, Dir., CASEA
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© Copyright 1965
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

First Printing, February, 1965
Second Printing, August, 1965
Third Printing, November, 1965
Fourth Printing, April, 1966
Fifth Printing, November, 1966

Printed in the United States of America
at the University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon
Designed and edited by Joanne M. Kitchel
The text of this book is set in Janson type
on Simpson's eggshell text
Library of Congress Catalog Number 65-63432

Foreword

Organizations have careers in much the same sense that individuals have careers. In the tracing out of organizational careers, a number of changes can always be detected, even among the seemingly most stable organizations.

Change in organizations comes about in many ways. Some changes occur with the size of the organization and some changes occur with the maturation process. Also, organizational change results, sometimes dramatically but most often not, from the succession of people through key offices. Similarly, a kind of evolutionary change in organizations can be seen as they adapt to forces within or conditions of their environments. To some extent, changes of this order can be called "organizational drift" because they frequently go unnoticed by those who direct the affairs of an organization. The effect of these rather gradual changes are almost imperceptibly viewed over a short time span but sometimes loom large when the overall career of the organization is considered.

In addition to organizational change that might be characterized as drift, change comes about in organizations by design or deliberate plan. Being seemingly "self" conscious about ends to be achieved and means of achieving ends, organizations strive for survival, if not perfection, and seem constantly to be proposing and carrying out change plans. It is this latter type of change, *planned change*, which is treated in this publication.

This publication is a report of a seminar conducted with public school officials by the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon. The seminar, considered a pilot venture, had as its main objective the enhancement of the school officials' understanding of the planned change processes and of their skills in carrying out planned change. In formulating the design of the seminar we were aided by members of the Committee on Inservice Education of the Oregon Association of School Administrators. Some changes in the order and nature of events were made while the seminar was in progress; these changes resulted from the almost continuous conversation with the consultants and other interested persons on the question, "How are things going?"

The seminar, held in Portland, Oregon in October, 1964, revolved

around two major elements: (1) small group discussions of papers prepared for the seminar by four consulting social scientists, and (2) what were termed "clinic sessions." These sessions brought the school officials and the social scientists together in small groups where attention was given to specific change problems that had been, and were being encountered by the school officials. In advance of the clinic sessions, the school officials prepared memoranda of their specific problems.

All of the events of the seminar are not reported here, nor does the order of the contents of this publication follow the order of the seminar itself.[1]

The publication includes three of the four papers prepared for the seminar by the consulting social scientists—those by Matthew B. Miles, Art Gallaher, Jr., and Everett M. Rogers. Unfortunately we were unable to secure publication rights to the paper by James Q. Wilson and consequently his work does not appear here. The papers by Richard O. Carlson and Roland J. Pellegrin, although they were read during the seminar, were not part of the grist for the mill in the clinic and discussion sessions. It will be noted that the papers of these latter two contributors present different perspectives on planned change from those contained in the papers by the consultants and in the summaries of the group discussions.

The final section of this publication is a summary of the seminar itself which was made by Donald E. Tope at its concluding session.

Some financial aid for the seminar was provided by the National Institute of Mental Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Our indebtedness extends also to the University Council for Educational Administration for the aid which was provided through its Executive Director, Jack Culbertson. Although they are unnamed here, many persons contributed a variety of talents to the task of the seminar and their efforts are gratefully acknowledged.

RICHARD O. CARLSON
KEITH GOLDHAMMER
Seminar Coordinators

February, 1965
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, Eugene, Oregon

[1] Although absent from this publication, a discussion of *The Jackson County Story* was included in the seminar. This case study exists in published form and may be obtained from the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon. (*The Jackson County Story, A Case Study,* by Keith Goldhammer and Frank Farner. University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1964.)

Contents

Foreword v

1
Barriers to Change in Public Schools RICHARD O. CARLSON 3

2
Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground MATTHEW B. MILES 11

3
Directed Change in Formal Organizations: The School System ART GALLAHER, JR. 37

4
What Are Innovators Like? EVERETT M. ROGERS 55

5
The Place of Research in Planned Change ROLAND J. PELLEGRIN 65

6
Seminar on *Change Processes in the Public Schools*

A. SUMMARIES OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS 79

B. SUMMARY OF SEMINAR 89

3

Directed Change in Formal Organizations:

The School System

By
ART GALLAHER, JR.

EA 000 716

Directed Change in Formal Organizations: The School System

ART GALLAHER, JR.
University of Kentucky

IN THE PAPER that follows I shall examine certain limited phenomena and raise a number of issues that seem relevant—always from the viewpoint of an anthropologist—and I shall make a number of suggestions which, when recast in your own frame of reference, will serve as positions for discussion. I propose to do this by first examining the nature of change as it is viewed by anthropologists. In this discussion I will emphasize the role of advocate because I believe it is crucial. This will be followed by an examination of the concept "formal organization," with some attention turned on the organizational peculiarities of the school and the implications of these for understanding directed educational change. I shall then comment briefly on what seems to me the crucial problem before the seminar—the potential of the school administrator in the role of advocate.

THE NATURE OF CHANGE

When the anthropolgist talks of change he speaks of change in culture because the latter, more than any other concept, focuses the great number of diverse interests which characterize anthropology as a behavioral science. By culture is meant those ideas, socially transmitted and learned, shared by the members of a group and toward which in their behavior they tend to conform.[1] Culture, then, provides the selective guidelines—ways of feeling, thinking, and reacting—that distinguish one group from another. This is true whether by group we refer to large social systems, such as nation-state societies, or, more relevant for our purposes, to smaller social systems, formal organiza-

[1] For the many ways in which culture has been defined by anthropologists and other behavioral scientists, see A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions.* Papers of the Peabody Museum, Vol. XLVII, No. 1, Harvard University, 1952. This volume lists some 160 definitions and groups these according to the qualities of culture that are emphasized. This particular work demonstrates what a tremendously rich and fluid concept culture really is.

tions such as a hospital, a labor union, or a school system in a given community. As a convenient way of denoting a lower level of conceptual abstraction, the latter are sometimes called "subcultures."

The preoccupation with culture by anthropologists rests on a number of basic premises, two of which are especially germane to our interests in this seminar. One is the belief held by anthropologists that culture, since it is socially transmitted and learned, and since it is a major adaptive mechanism of man, is bound to change.[2] Very early in their empirical data anthropologists became aware of the *normative* quality of culture, that is, in a given social situation the carriers of a culture can define the *ideal* behavior pattern that is called for. It was apparent just as early, too, that there were gaps between the ideal and the *actual* patterns of behavior. The significance of this finding ultimately led to the premise that a given culture is bound to change with time because 1) man's adjustment to his non-human environment is never fully complete, what Wilbert Moore calls *the constant environmental challenge*,[3] and 2) no known group is free from social deviation though such information does not always find its way into the monographs written by anthropologists. If we want to view this in a slightly different way, the sociocultural systems developed by man are tension-producing as well as tension-reducing, and the attempts to manage tension are productive of innovation and its acceptance.[4] I am, therefore, suggesting that a tension-management organizational model is useful for culture change purposes because, among other reasons, it implies the viewpoint that change is a natural consequence of human social life.

Though it was recognized early in anthropology that changes in culture could be internally derived, as through *invention* and *discovery*, the greater attention by far has been paid to changes that accompany contact between groups. Two of the more important concepts developed to explain contact change are *diffusion*,[5] which refers to the

---

[2] This belief has not always characterized anthropology; many of the early field-workers, who studied mainly isolated societies, accepted a model of culture as essentially stable. However, as culture came to be understood better this interpretation proved so inadequate that some theorists asserted the other extreme, that every culture is, in fact, in a constant and continuous state of change. Without qualification, the latter position is as misleading as the former. Most contemporary anthropologists would accept Keesing's suggestion as more in line with the facts; that is, "Proper perspective on this problem must see forces making both for stability and change." See Felix M. Keesing, *Cultural Anthropology*, Rinehart & Co., New York, 1958, p. 384.

[3] In an unpublished paper titled "Developmental Change in Urban-Industrial Societies." This paper will be published in a volume of essays on Developmental Change, edited by Art Gallaher, Jr.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Diffusion in Anthropology has been concerned mainly with the distribution of elements of culture as opposed to a concern with diffusion as process. The latter is much more identified with rural sociologists. See Everett M. Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovations*, The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1962, for a

transfer of culture elements from one group to another, and *acculturation*,[6] which refers to changes occurring in the culture of one group in contact with another. Out of the research focused on these two concepts came the distinction between *non-directed* and *directed* culture change.[7] It is the latter, of course, that is important to us.

By directed culture change is meant a structured situation in which an advocate interferes actively and purposefully with the culture of a potential acceptor. In this situation an advocate consciously selects elements in a *target system* (that which is to be changed) and by stimulating the acceptance of innovations, inhibiting the practice of prior patterns of behavior, or, as is frequently the case, doing both of these things simultaneously, he manages the direction of change. The success with which this is done depends mainly on 1) how the advocate plays his role, particularly his use of authority, and 2) the behavior of those who make up the target system. We shall return to the matter of change shortly, but before talking of the second major premise that we need to have in mind, let me emphasize that I believe the way that the advocate plays his role is one of the more crucial variables in the success or failure of attempts to direct change.

A second premise regarding the nature of culture that is particularly important to us is the belief held by anthropologists that parts of a culture, however conceptualized, are linked to other parts and, therefore, any element of culture is comprehended fully only by understanding its relationship to other simultaneously present, relevant facts. This is, of course, the *structural-functional* viewpoint,[8] and

---

good statement by a rural sociologist; see also Herbert F. Lionberger, *Adoption of New Ideas and Practices*, Iowa State University Press, 1960. For a statement by an anthropologist, see the last three chapters of Ralph Linton, *Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes*. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1940. A number of other general works in anthropology, published during the 1930's and later, include sections of diffusion.

[6] Acculturation is one of the major concepts used by anthropologists in their studies of change process. One of the first attempts to systematize the concept was by a Social Science Research Council Sub-Committee on Acculturation, composed of Melville Herskovits, Robert Redfield, and Ralph Linton. The results of the seminar were published in 1937 and were recently made available again under the original title, *Acculturation: The Study of Culture Contact*, by Peter Smith, Publisher, Gloucester, Mass., 1958. The bibliographic reference is to Melville J. Herskovits. Another Social Science Research Council Seminar grappled with the concept in 1953. The results of that seminar are reported as "Acculturation: An Exploratory Formulation" in the *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 56, No. 6, Pt. 1, 1954, pp. 973-1003. Another useful publication is *Acculturation Abstracts*, edited by Bernard Siegel. Stanford University Press, 1955.

[7] For an early statement regarding this distinction, see Ralph Linton, *Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes*, op. cit. ch. 10. For a more recent statement on types of contact change, see Edward H. Spicer, "Types of Contact and Processes of Change" in *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change*, edited by E. H. Spicer, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

[8] This refers to the basic premise of functionalism. For an excellent summary of the concept see Raymond Firth's "Function," in *Current Anthropology*, edited

if we keep in mind that the interdependence of parts that is implied is not absolute but is rather a matter of degree, it is a view that is not only useful but one that I believe necessary for understanding the full ramifications of change processes.[9] In line with this, the distinction between manifest and latent functions is especially relevant for understanding directed sociocultural change situations.[10] I say this because, in directed change, purpose should be made explicit, and it is precisely at the manifest-latent level of analysis that we confront directly the matter of purpose. By manifest function we shall refer to those objective, hence intended, consequences of whatever part of culture we define; by latent we shall refer to the unintended and unrecognized consequences of the same order.[11] For example, in a rural community that I once did research in I found that the manifest function of membership on the school board was to serve the school by working with the superintendent in budget and other policy matters. At the same time, a latent function of membership on the board was the acquisition of a kind of political power that had nothing whatsoever to do with education, but which, when exercised, was very often detrimental to the manifest objectives of the school system.

We can now turn our attention to some of the variables viewed by anthropologists as influencing the acceptance or ultimate rejection of innovation. In order to facilitate our understanding of these variables let me first introduce a conceptual framework within which we can perceive them as related. In this regard it will be useful for us to have in mind what is meant by a *culture change cycle*. The latter is viewed by anthropologists as involving three broadly conceived processes. These are: 1) *innovation*, the process whereby a new element of culture or combination of elements is made available to a group; 2) *dissemination*, the process whereby an innovation comes to be shared; and 3) *integration*, the process whereby an innovation becomes mutually adjusted to other elements in the system.[12] In our discussion here, attention will focus mainly on the more significant concepts and variables by which we understand innovation and dissemination.

Homer Barnett, who has authored the most extensive anthropological treatise on innovation, sees it as a mental process, and makes the point that every man is a potential innovator. Barnett is concerned es-

---

by William L. Thomas, Jr., University of Chicago Press, 1955. See also Laura Thompson, *Toward a Science of Mankind*, McGraw-Hill Co., 1961, p. 9. Also, see Harry Johnson, *Sociology*, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1960, pp. 48-63.

[9] See Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Free Press, 1957, pp. 25 et seq., and Alvin W. Gouldner, "Reciprocity and Autonomy in Functional Theory," in L. Z. Gross, Ed., *Symposium on Social Theory*, Row, Peterson, 1958.

[10] Neal Gross makes this point for educational sociology in "The Sociology of Education," in Robert Merton, et. al. (eds.) *Sociology Today*, Basic Books, 1959.

[11] See Robert K. Merton, op cit., pp. 61-66.

[12] Ralph Linton, op. cit., last three chapters.

sentially with the creative act of innovation, and he turns most of his attention on delineating the cultural and psychological variables which underlie specific innovative processes.[13] I do not believe, however, that our concern in this seminar is in that direction. Rather, we are more concerned with the introduction of changes in ways that will best gain their acceptance. It will be useful for us, then, to distinguish between the term *innovator*, which we will reserve for the individual or agency responsible for the conception of an innovation, and *advocate*, which we shall use to refer to individuals or agencies who sponsor an innovation for the express purpose of gaining its acceptance by others.[14] Thus, in the directed change situation we can assume that the role of advocate is always a purposive one. With these few comments out of the way, we can turn our attention to some of the variables which influence the definition and enactment of the advocacy role.

Elsewhere I have suggested that there are two major role models for advocacy,[15] that the distinction between these is one of means rather than ends, and that in each case the conception of means for gaining acceptance derives from assumptions about the nature of change. The model that I call the *pragmatic advocate* prescribes a role concerned mainly with creating a climate conducive to acceptance; the view of the culture change cycle is global, acceptance is to be achieved, but the *processes of acceptance* are accorded signal importance. This model rests on the premise that success or failure in directed change is referable mainly to the advocate's understanding of the content and internal organization of the pattern where change is sought.

The *Utopic model* defines the advocate's role mainly as one of manipulation to gain the acceptance of an innovation; the view of the culture change cycle is myopic, it focuses almost exclusively on the *act of acceptance*. There is a basic premise that one can achieve results best by doing things to, or planning for, people rather than with them.

For most cases I believe the pragmatic model is the best for achieving genuine change; that is, acceptance that is valued. I believe it is best because it is based on complete and detailed knowledge of the target system, and in the directed change situation there is no substitute for that. There is, in fact, a large body of research to support the basic assumptions underlying the pragmatic model, that is that people will more readily accept innovations that they can understand

---

[13] Homer Barnett, *Innovation: The Basis of Culture Change*. McGraw-Hill Co., New York, 1953, especially chapters 2-6.

[14] Ibid., pp. 291-295.

[15] Art Gallaher, Jr., "The Role of the Advocate and Directed Change." Paper read at the University of Nebraska Symposium on Identifying Techniques and Principles for Gaining Acceptance of Research Results. To be published in a volume edited by Wes Mierhenry.

and perceive as relevant,[16] and secondly, that they have had a hand in planning.[17] Working from this model, and with these two assumptions in mind, the task of the advocate is made easier if he is prestigeful in ways that are valued by the target system. Related to the matter of prestige, and very often a function of it, is the more important variable of the *dependence upon authority*[18] that is shared in the target system. This is a simple and practical matter of the following order: in a given community are potential acceptors willing to adopt an innovation in the public school system advocated by a school administrator, or will they follow the lead of a physician or a political pressure group of "super-patriots," or other source of opposition? Who are those who command some kind of authority and who, because of it, can be expected to serve logically as emulative models in the dissemination of an innovation?

In the directed change situation I believe that dependence upon authority is one of the more crucial variables. I would urge those who must plan educational change in our society to give careful consideration to the kinds of authority to which innovations are tied. It may be that conventional authorities already present are inadequate. We may need to invent new ones, and with the assistance of mass media and other devices by which we manage such things, endow them with the kind of prestige and other qualities necessary to get the job done.

Viewed in a different way, the matter of authority assumes added relevance. If we view authority as the control that some members in the group have over the activities of others, it follows that those with rank and power in an organization control rewards. Rewards are, in fact, a major mediating factor in the reciprocity that characterizes the social relationship of those with power and those without it. Stated bluntly, those in authority can sometimes effect change by denying customary reciprocity; that is, by manipulating rewards in ways that deny the target system an expected gratification.[19] We must

---

[16] The list of sources is long. The following, taken from research done in management and industry, support this hypothesis. Robert A. Goodwin and Charles A. Nelson (eds.), *Toward the Liberally Educated Executive*, the New American Library, New York, 1960; Auren Uris, *The Management Makers*, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1962, pp. 91-164; Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnell, *Principles of Management*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1959, pp. 359-385.

[17] Again, the list of sources to support this hypothesis is long. A representative sample would include the following: Georges Friedman, *Industrial Society*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1955, pp. 261-372; Kurt Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change," in T. Newcomb and E. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1949, pp. 330-344; Edward H. Spicer, *Human Problems in Technological Change*, Russell Sage Foundation, 1952, cases 7, 8, 11, 14.

[18] Homer Barnett, op. cit., Ch. 3, for a discussion of this variable in connection with innovation.

[19] For a good discussion of this point see Charles P. Loomis, "Tentative Types of Directed Social Change Involving Systemic Linkage," *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 24, No. 4, Dec., 1959, pp. 383-390.

keep in mind, however, that the distinction between those with authority and those without it is not always clearly defined; in a given organization there may exist checks and balances on the definitions and use of authority. In this regard, Howard Becker's research on the authority systems of the public school is very interesting.[20] So far as the professional functionaries are concerned, and here we are talking of administrators and teachers, each controls sanctions that permit some control over the other's behavior. However, I shall later make the point that authority in the educational organization, because its goal is service, derives its significance more at that point where the organization articulates with the client group.

There is another variable that I should like to stress as especially crucial in the success of an advocate in a directed change situation and that is *the expectation of change*[21] shared by members of the target system. It is important for an advocate to know the areas of culture where people value change and where they have come to expect it. These are channels into which innovations can be fed with the greatest chance of success. On the other hand, if such expectations are not present, or if innovations cannot be tailored to fit those that are, the advocate may find their creation essential to his long-range task. In line with this, an important quality for the target system to have is the capacity for criticism.[22] It may well be that this capacity is not present, and that it will have to be encouraged. A corollary that the advocate should keep in mind here, however, is that the *margin of security* for many in the target system may be very low, hence an alternative in the form of an innovation becomes doubly threatening. This is somewhat contrary to the long-held view that those who derive security from an organization are reluctant to change the vehicle of their success. I am suggesting that in formal organizations of a service variety, such as educational systems are, the opposite might well be true—those who are secure can sustain the threat of examining alternatives, whereas those whose margin of security is low will resist changing a system that has *accommodated to them.* In practical terms, within our present frame of reference, I am posing the hypothesis that the better teachers in a given school system are more likely to accept innovations than are the poorer ones; the more educationally secure members of the client group are more likely to accept innova-

[20] "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.) *Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1961, pp. 243-255.

[21] Homer Barnett, op. cit., Chapter 2 for a discussion of "expectation of change" as a cultural variable in innovation.

[22] See Margaret Mead, "Changing Culture: Some Observation in Primitive Societies," in *The Human Meaning of the Social Sciences*, edited by Daniel Lerner, Meridian Books, 1959. In this article Dr. Mead explores the variables which cause people to reflect on culture change.

tions in the system than those who are less familiar with the intricacies of the educational process.

A number of other variables that influence the acceptance and rejection of innovation involve the general matter of *scale*. For example, what is the extent of the target system's *felt need* for change? Is the *time factor* right; that is, is the system already undergoing change, or is there a target system apathy induced by previous innovative failures? There is also the matter of size in the system to be changed, and the associated organizational complexity that varies with size. The latter bears importantly on communications effectiveness, which in turn relates to the problem of determining the most viable unit for effecting change. It might be that even when the entire target system is scheduled for change, it can be done best by changing smaller, more manageable components one at a time.

One further point regarding communications should be emphasized and that is, the advocate in his concern with the formal properties of communication systems should not ignore the informal, less structured channels for moving information. In formal organizations the social cliques that develop among work associates or around some other common interest can be invaluable channels for communicating information *so that it will be accepted*.

The Nature of Formal Organizations

By formal organization we shall mean one that is deliberately conceived and planned for the explicit purpose of achieving certain goals. All organizations have social structure and they can be viewed as subcultures. If they are of any considerable size the most significant aspects of social structure are typically a centralized authority and an ordered status hierarchy. Viewed as a subculture, the formal organization has at minimum a normative system that defines the purpose, the *goal-orientation*, of the personnel who occupy the specialized statuses and perform specialized roles within the organization. At its most formal level the dimensions of the subculture are prescribed in the organization's official body of rules. Though the structural and cultural aspects of organization seem obvious, we must make sure that they are not so obvious that we lose sight of them. In directed change especially we should continually explicate these two dimensions and keep them conceptually separate. We must know which we plan to change. For example, do we want to modify structure to more efficiently attain goals in the system, or do we want to maintain a structure and innovate new goals? Above all, an advocate must never assume that change in one aspect will necessarily lead to desired change in the other. Depending on the organization in a change situation, culture and social structure may each manifest peculiarly stubborn strains toward autonomy.

So far as directed change is concerned, those aspects of formal organization that are most important are the authority that we attach to the structure and, from a cultural standpoint, the matter of a goal-orientation and normative procedures for arriving at defined goals. The dimension of authority which has received the most attention in the formal organization literature is legitimation. The latter, which can be crucial in directed change situations, has been a topic of some concern by social scientists, especially since Max Weber addressed himself to the subject. Weber believed that authority in organizations is legitimated in three ways: 1) by the sanctity of tradition, 2) by values that derive from conceptions of the divine or supernatural power (the Charismatic leader), and 3) by a belief in the supremacy of the law.[23]

There is no need for us to elaborate these categories here. Rather, we can agree with Gouldner[24] when he says:

> "The authority of the modern administrator is characteristically legitimated on the basis of his specialized expertise; that is, administrators are regarded as proper incumbents of office on the basis of what they know about the organization or their professional skills, rather than whom they know."

Since we have suggested earlier that the tension-management model is a good one for understanding the dynamics of change, it is interesting to note here that Gouldner[25] also sees the problems surrounding authority as constituting a major factor in organizational tension.

From the standpoint of directed change the matter of authority in formal organizations derives its importance from factors other than mere legitimation. For example, in a formal organization what statuses are most likely to be extended to encompass the advocacy role? A logical hypothesis is that statuses with the most authority legitimated around the goals of an organization are the ones that advocacy responsibility is most likely to be attached to. Among other things, such statuses presumably have more sanctions vested in them than do others. However, successful innovation often is achieved only in the absence of formal sanctions, in which case persuasion or other methods are employed. Therefore, viewed from the perspective of the target system we need to ask the following: does the target system view the role of authorities legitimated by the functional requirements of the organization as including also the responsibility for innovation? They may not. In fact, their perception of the legitimated authority's role set may emphasize the opposite so strongly that they

---

[23] See H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (trans. and eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 196-204.

[24] Alvin W. Gouldner, "Organizational Analysis," in Robert K. Merton, et. al. (eds.), *Sociology Today*, Basic Books, New York, 1959, pp. 413.

[25] Ibid., pp. 413-416.

will not tolerate a redefinition of it to include innovative responsibility. Those who direct change in formal organizations should keep in mind the formal properties of a system do not tell the whole story; in the matter of authority just mentioned, for example, recipients can and do organize in ways that enable them to resist pressures placed by formal authority.

It seems appropriate at this point, then, to emphasize that the formal aspects of social structure and culture which characterize an organization are always accompanied by networks of informal relations and unofficial norms. The informal relations that emerge are, of course, related to the nature of the organization and they, in turn, mold the behavior of functionaries in ways which obviously influence the formal properties of the system. In short, there are in all formal organizations elements of structure that are organizationally unprescribed, such as cliques and informal status structures, but which are not unrelated to the formal elements of structure. For example, a clique of work associates can easily resist pressures placed on them to increase production, accept innovations, and the like,[26] and it is a fortunate school administrator, indeed, who has not had to contend with the passive resistance techniques of teachers.[27] We know group cohesiveness to be one of the most important aspects of the informal structure.

Concomitant with the informal structures are elements of culture, that is, patterns of belief and sentiment, that are also organizationally unprescribed. For example, in a given school system there is every likelihood that one will find the unofficial norm that one teacher must never question another's grade, even if it is known that the grade is unjustified. To do so is to threaten the authority system that the teachers are attempting to define.[28] Again, it is worth reiterating that those who direct change in formal organizations will find it imperative to have knowledge of both the formal and informal aspects of the target system.

Another feature of formal organizations that must always be kept in mind is that they never exist in a social vacuum, but rather are linked to other organizations in a larger social system. From an analytical viewpoint we must, then, establish the parameters within which the formal organization derives its significance; that is, the boundaries within which authority is legitimated, goals are defined, and decisions are made. It is important to keep in mind that there is no inherent congruity between these three levels of action; one may rest on the local autonomy of the organization itself, whereas the other two may derive significance mainly from the external environment.

---

[26] See especially F. J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, *Management and the Worker*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1939.

[27] Howard K. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," op. cit.

[28] Ibid.

In a very worthwhile article on organizational analysis, Gouldner[29] casts linkage not in the conceptual framework of integration of the parts, but rather from the vantage point of "the functional autonomy of organizational parts." Again, with our tension management model in mind, he offers the interesting hypothesis that " . . . the structure of complex organizations . . . serves to maintain and protect the parts from others within the same system, at least in some degree. Thus organizational structure is shaped by a tension between centrifugal and centripetal pressures, limiting as well as imposing control over parts, separating as well as joining them." More than any other formal organization that I can presently think of, an understanding of the adjustment of the school to its external environment is crucial for those who would guide us to innovations in education.[30] This becomes even more relevant when we understand some of the peculiar qualities that characterize the school system as a formal organization. I am referring to the peculiarities associated with the two aspects for formal organization—authority and the establishment and maintenance of goals—that I have identified as crucial in directed change. We now turn our attention to these considerations.

Comments on the School System as a Formal Organization

Viewed from a global perspective, the most significant quality of the school as a formal organization to keep in mind is that it is a *service organization.*[31] This means that the prime beneficiary of the organization is the client group, which in turn becomes a crucial variable in determining the limits and kinds of authority that are developed, and the goal orientation that the organization will take.

The professional functionaries in the school, that is administrators and teachers, confront continually the dilemma of legitimating their authority to determine goals in the system.[32] By all of the rights of passage, whether administrator or teacher, theirs is a specialized expertise that presumably equips them to determine the client beneficiaries' own best interests. However, I believe we should have to look long and hard to find a client group—those served by hospital, mental health, social work organizations, to name a few—that more agressively questions professional authority than the one served by education. This is not new, it is a traditional matter. With a wide spectrum of values to draw from, many of which are anti-intellectual and not the least of which is local autonomy, the client group has, indeed, in-

---

[29] Alvin W. Gouldner, 1959, op. cit.

[30] Neal Gross, op. cit., makes the point that this is an area that needs research by those interested in the sociology of education.

[31] Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, *Formal Organizations*, Chandler Publishing Company, San Francisco, 1962, Chapter 2.

[32] Ibid, pp. 51-54. The point is made that service organizations commonly face the problem of becoming captives of the client group.

sisted upon a system which permits formal control to rest in the hands of laymen.[33] This control is given its most explicity symbolic representation in that major structural link between the school and its external environment, including the client group itself, the school board. As Gross[34] suggests, we need to understand this phenomenon better. For example, if the manifest function of a school board is to establish policies governing a local public-school system, what are the latent functions of a school board? It is not hard to receive the impression in many communities that the board has as its main function the protection of the community from the schools.

It is true that the power to legitimate authority and to establish goals is not as much in the local community or school district today as formerly. Much, in fact, has been relinquished to the state. However, enough is there to make this one of the very real problems for planning educational change. This is true because *so many problems currently defined in local school systems, and the innovations necessary to solve them, today owe their relevance to larger systems, such as the region or the nation-state*, more than at any prior period in our history. At the same time, because of racial integration, the prayer decision, and other political developments in our society, there is the greatest possible concern with local autonomy. There are, in fact, disturbing reports from teachers in all sections of the country that their professional status is increasingly threatened, especially by reactionary political elements that hope to reduce alternative goals in education. The client group's new and vigorous interest in local autonomy could not come at a time when it is more out of touch with the sociocultural reality in which education must find its place. This seemingly paradoxical situation—*the concern of local client groups in the power to legitimate authority, a centrifugal tendency, contrasted to the centripetal one of problems in the local system, and the innovations necessary to solve them, deriving from larger systems—could well be the most difficult problem area for educational innovators.* Its importance should not be underestimated.

The task of professional functionaries is probably more difficult in service organizations than in any other kind. They must serve the collective interests of the client group and at the same time retain their authority and not become subservient to the demands of the client group.[35] I need only remind you that surrender to the client is not unknown in education. Many administrators and teachers take the line of least resistance and there are cases known where systems have surrendered to the client group.[36]

---

[33] This point is also made by Neal Gross, op. cit., p. 137. He suggests this as an area that needs research in the sociology of education.

[34] Ibid., p. 133.

[35] Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, op. cit., pp. 51-54.

[36] See especially Burton R. Clark, *Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity*, University of California Press, 1956.

From the positive side, though, educational planners can derive some comfort from the knowledge that traditionally Americans have kept a kind of flexibility in their thinking about education and certainly a predisposition to change content and method. I am not sure that this predisposition to weigh alternatives is so evident when goals are involved, but then the latter are not always explicit. We might, in fact, say that more attention should be given to explicating viable goals in education, especially if we are to turn more of our attention on planning for change. Nevertheless, the process of education has been tied one way or another to related considerations of change, such as the dominant concern with social mobility, and this has led to something of an expectation of change in education. Those who direct innovations should be alert to this and, whenever possible, take advantage of it. Again, a word of caution is in order: the concern for local autonomy that I have mentioned may not permit this expectation of change to carry over into problem areas that derive their significance from beyond the local area or region.

The School Administrator as Advocate

The research in anthropology points to two classes of people as those most likely to be successful in bringing about change. Barnett,[37] who believes that the essential element in the innovative process is dissatisfaction, suggests four categories of people as innovators; these are also the ones most likely to initially accept an innovation. However, we have distinguished conceptually between the role of innovator and that of advocate and have indicated that it is the latter that concerns us. I would question that the success of the advocate is related to dissatisfaction; rather, it derives more from other qualities and dissatisfaction may or may not be present. As I have already indicated, I am inclined to the view that it is more important for the advocate to have prestige,[38] and/or that members of the target system depend upon his authority in matters of change.[39]

With these few comments out of the way we can turn our attention now on the role of the school administrator as it presently stands, and offer some comment on his potential as an advocate. I am referring, of course, to the generalized status and role of school administrator, recognizing that there are individual exceptions to the rule. If I had to summarize the school administrator's role in one phrase, it would be *he is the man in the middle*.[40] He stands between the client group,

---

[37] Homer Barnett, "Personal Conflicts and Culture Change," *Social Forces*, Vol. 20, pp. 160-171.

[38] Richard N. Adams, "Personnel in Culture Change: A Test of a Hypothesis," *Social Forces*, Vol. 30, pp. 185-189.

[39] Homer Barnett, *Innovation: The Basis for Culture Change*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, Chapter 3.

[40] For a good discussion of the "man in the middle" see John Useem, John D. Donoghue, and Ruth Hill Useem, "Men in the Middle of the Third Culture," *Human Organization*, Vol. 22, 1963, pp. 169-179.

technically represented by the school board, and professional and other functionaries who comprise the educational system. "He faces towards several different audiences, each with different sets of demands—school boards, parents, parent groups, teachers, and students—as well as other administrators. He has to play his role appropriately in the light of all these demands."[41]

From a functional viewpoint our "man in the middle" has what Spindler[42] calls *a balancing role.*

> "His job is in large part that of maintaining a working equilibrium of at best antagonistically cooperative forces. This is one of the reasons why *school administrators are rarely outspoken protagonists of a consistent and vigorously profiled point of view.* Given the nature of our culture and social system, and the close connection between the public and the schools *he cannot alienate significant segments of that public and stay in business.*" (Italics mine)

Because his role is a balancing one, and because I see nothing in our sociocultural system to indicate that the linkage of the public and the schools will tolerate any other, I have strong reservations that the school administrator status is the one to assign advocacy functions to. I have already indicated that there seems to be a centrifugal tendency toward local autonomy in legitimating authority, and that at the local level the client group traditionally manages authority. *If* the problems in education were those that could be solved at the local level, *if* the client group was capable of structuring innovative procedures for meeting such problems, and *if* the client group maintained its traditional controls, the school administrator would automatically advocate innovations to other functionaries because of his position in the status hierarchy of the organization. But the system is not that way, and fortunately so. The problems of the local school, and the solutions to these problems, as we have indicated, come from centripetal forces that are pulling each local system out of its environment and into systems that are broader in scale. The sources of local client-centered authority may not be aware of the significance of the larger system or, what is worse, may not even care or resist the fact that it exists. Under these conditions they are not apt to permit advocacy as part of the administrative role. And since the role of advocate is purposive and one that involves commitment that, even under the best of change circumstances, sometimes involves conflict, the school administrator might reduce his balancing role effectiveness if he assumes advocacy. I do not mean the administrator should avoid any concern with change, because that is impossible. Rather, I am asserting that I do not

---

[41] George Spindler (ed.), *Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1963, p. 142.

[42] Ibid., p. 238.

believe the problems of change should rest mainly in the administrator's status.

I suggest that we are at an appropriate juncture in our society, meaning that the problems of education viewed from whatever perspective are of sufficient magnitude, to innovate positions that have as their special role function the management of educational change. This could be a special unit called Experimental Education, Planning Division, or by some other innocuous title, built into systems that could afford it. For those that could not meet the expense of such a unit, we should begin to think in terms of a model, perhaps patterned along the lines of agricultural extension. An *educational extension* with a research program focused on creating alternatives and an action program to prepare change agents to assist school systems with innovation, dissemination, and integration problems, is well worth considering. Change is a natural and inevitable consequence of the sociocultural and physical worlds within which our collective lives are acted out and it should be just as natural and just as inevitable that we should give some attention to managing the direction of that change. In line with this, one final word of caution—planning is not something to be taken lightly or as something that just happens; rather, *planning is activity and in and of itself is process.*